

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-4 and 8-15 are currently being prosecuted.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

*Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1-4 and 8-14 (7-14 in the Action) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Terui et al. (U.S. Published Application US 2002/0145180A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out Figure 10 where a die 403 presses on two separated die pads 401P and 401G each connected to power and ground voltage levels. A plurality of leadfingers 405 and 407 are provided as well as passive component 410 having opposite ends connected to the two die pads. The Examiner also points out Figure 2 where the busbar 111 (stated as 11 in the Action) is disposed between non adjacent leads and extends between leadfingers P and G. Applicants disagree that the presently amended claims are anticipated by this reference.

Claim 1 has now been amended to recite the three different groups of leadfingers and their connection with the plurality of metal wires. In addition, the passive component is now described as being connected to the signal leadfinger group. This differs from the Terui et al. reference where the passive component is connected to the power and ground leads. Since the reference does not show an

arrangement where the passive component can be connected to the signal leads, the claim is not anticipated by this reference. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not obvious over this reference either. The connection of a resistor, for example, between power and ground leadfingers often deals with the arrangement of the power supply. Connecting the passive component to one of the signal leadfingers is not involved with such a power supply arrangement. Applicants submit that connection of the passive component with the signal leadfinger group is not shown or suggested by Terui et al. For this reason, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2, 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims has other features that make these claims additionally allowable.

Claim 8 is a method claim and has now been amended to recite the same three leadfinger groups. Also the claim now describes that the passive component is connected to the signal leadfinger group. This is also not seen in the reference, as described above in regard to claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 8 is likewise allowable.

Claims 9-15 depend from claim 8 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features of the invention which makes the claims additionally allowable.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Terui et al. in view of Venkateshwaran et al. (U.S. Patent 6,316,822) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In discussing this reference in regard to the claim, the Examiner states that the reference shows the use of alloys in lead frames. However, Applicants note that claim 15 does not include this limitation. Applicants believe the Examiner meant to apply this rejection against claim 14 instead. In any case, even if the Venkateshwaran et al. reference does teach the use of alloys in leadfingers, Applicants submit that the dependent claim is allowable based on its dependence from allowable claim 8. Applicants submit that this rejection is likewise overcome.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied upon by the Examiner either alone or in combination thereof. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$110.00 is attached herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By James T. Eller, Jr. #39,538  
Joe McKinney Muncy, #32,334

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

KM/RFG/adt/njp  
2019-0202P